arXiv:1704.02689v1 [math.OC] 10 Apr 2017

ZERO-SUM STOCHASTIC DIFFERENTIAL GAME WITH RISK-SENSITIVE COST

ANUP BISWAS AND SUBHAMAY SAHA

Abstract. Zero sum games with risk-sensitive cost criterion are considered with underlying dynamics being given by controlled stochastic differential equations. Under the assumption of geometric stability on the dynamics , we completely characterize all possible saddle point strategies in the class of stationary Markov controls. In addition, we also establish existence-uniqueness result for the value function of the Hamilton-Jacobi-Isaacs equation.

1. Introduction

This article concerns with zero-sum game for risk-sensitive costs where the underlying dynamics of the players are given by non-degenerate controlled stochastic differential equations. There are two players, one of them tries to minimize his/her payoff and the other one tries to maximize it. The maximizing player may be thought of as *nature* who may choose a parametrization of the model to be totally adverse to the other controller, in a *non-anticipative* way. The admissible controls (or actions) of each player are assumed to take values in a space of probability measures over a compact metric space. In other words, each player chooses his/her control from a given collection of mixed strategies. As the system evolves, the costs are accumulated and the performance of a control policy is measured by a long-run average of risk-sensitive cost criterion. The main objective of this work is to find solution for the associated Hamilton-Jacobi-Isaacs (HJI) equation characterizing the value of the game and rendering saddle point strategies. The key results of this article can be roughly described as follows.

- *Existence and Uniqueness of solution* The HJI equation has an eigenpair $(V, \lambda) \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{R}$ where λ is the value of the game. Moreover, this solution is unique.
- *Verification result* Any measurable mini-max selector of the HJI equation form a saddle point strategy, and any saddle point strategy in the class of stationary Markov controls can be obtained as a measurable mini-max selector of the HJI equation.

Risk-sensitive (or *exponential-of-integral*) control has been an active area of research in the field of control theory. These problems were introduced by Jacobson [23] in seventies. We also refer to Whittle [28] and references therein for an early account of the risk-sensitive control literature. Most of these problems have concentrated on minimizing the risk-senstive payoff. Among the most relevant to the present are [3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 18, 27]. On the

Date: April 11, 2017.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 91A15; secondary: 91A23, 49N70.

Key words and phrases. stochastic differential games, risk-sensitive payoff, Hamilton-Jacobi-Isaacs equations, saddle point strategy, verification result.

other hand the number of literature on stochastic differential games with risk-sensitive cost criterion are very few [6, 7, 16, 19]. Basar [6] considers non-zero sum game with finite horizon risk-sensitive costs and establishes existence of Nash equilibrium whereas Ghosh et.al. [19] obtain existence of Nash equilibrium with long-run average of risk-sensitive payoff. Both zero sum and nonzero sum- game with finite horizon risk-sensitive cost criterion has been considered by El-Karoui and Hamadene [16] where the authors have used backward stochastic differential equation to prove existence of a saddle-point and an equilibrium point for respectively, the zero-sum and nonzero-sum games. In a recent work Basu and Ghosh [7] consider a zero-sum game with long–run average of risk-sensitive cost and claim to have proved existence of saddle points which are mini-max selector of the associated HJI equation. This work is done with bounded drift, diffusion coefficient and cost functions. After a careful reading we have found that the proofs of [7](see Theorem 3 and 4 there) contain some crucial error that do not seem to have an easy fix. In [7] the authors have constructed an eigenpair for the HJI equation and have made an attempt to show that this eigenvalue is the value of the game. But this can not be true as a recent work of Berestycki and Rossi [8] suggests that there are uncountably many eigenvalues (for the uncontrolled linear operator) with positive eigenfunctions. Therefore one has to look for the *principal* eigenvalue of HJI equation.

In this article we consider a large class (compared to [7]) of control problems. We prove not only the existence of a saddle point strategy, but also characterize all possible saddle point strategies in the class of stationary Markov controls. In addition, we also obtain the uniqueness of the value function for the HJI equations. To find the *principal* eigenpair of the HJI equation we start with the Dirichlet eigenvalue value problems in bounded domains where existence of principal eigenpair is known and then increase these domains to $\mathbb{R}^d$. This idea was used earlier by Biswas in [9] but for a simpler setting. The approach of [7, 19] is based on parabolic PDE where one introduces an additional *risk-sensitive parameter* θ multiplied with the running cost and studies the associated parabolic PDE, viewing θ as a time parameter. It seems this approach is not very much helpful in studying our game problem whereas the eigenvalue approach of [9] seems more natural in current situation. Another advantage in using the latter approach is the ease in obtaining stochastic representation of the value functions which helps us to apply strong maximum principle. It should be kept in mind that [9] deals with a minimization problem and it does not discuss characterization of the optimal stationary Markov controls. It turns out that the game problem is much more involved than the minimization problem. One of the reasons for this difficulty is that our game is a generalization to both minimization and maximization problems with risk-sensitive cost, and it is not easy to convert a maximization problem to a minimization problem of the same type. Therefore we separately study the maximization problem with risk-sensitive costs in Section 3 (see Theorem 3.1) and characterize the optimal stationary Markov controls.

Rest of the article is organized as follows. In the remaining part of this section we summarize the notations. Section 2 introduces the the problem setup and the main result. In section 3, we study a maximization problem with risk-sensitive criterion, and finally section 4 deals with the proof of the main Theorem.

Notation. The standard Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is denoted by $|\cdot|$. The set of nonnegative real numbers is denoted by $\mathbb{R}_+$, $\mathbb{N}$ stands for the set of natural numbers, and $\mathbb{1}$ denotes the indicator function. Given two real numbers a and b, the minimum (maximum) is denoted by $a \wedge b$ ($a \vee b$), respectively. The closure, boundary, and the complement of a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ are denoted by $\bar{A}$, ∂A, and A^c, respectively. We denote by $\tau(A)$ the *first exit time* of the process $\{X_t\}$ from the set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, defined by

$$\tau(A) \;:=\; \inf\{t > 0 :\, X_t \notin A\}\,.$$

The open ball of radius r in $\mathbb{R}^d$, centered at the origin, is denoted by B_r, and we let $\tau_r := \tau(B_r)$, and $\breve{\tau}_r := \tau(B_r^c)$.

The term *domain* in $\mathbb{R}^d$ refers to a nonempty, connected open subset of the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$. For a domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the space $\mathcal{C}^k(D)$ ($\mathcal{C}^\infty(D)$) refers to the class of all real-valued functions on D whose partial derivatives up to order k (of any order) exist and are continuous, and $\mathcal{C}_b(D)$ denotes the set of all bounded continuous real-valued functions on D. In addition $\mathcal{C}_c(D)$ denotes the class of functions in $\mathcal{C}(D)$ that have compact support, and $\mathcal{C}_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ the class of continuous functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ that vanish at infinity. By a slight abuse of notation, whenever the whole space $\mathbb{R}^d$ is concerned, we write $f \in \mathcal{C}^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$ whenever $f \in \mathcal{C}^k(D)$ for all bounded domains $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. The space $L^p(D)$, $p \in [1,\infty)$, stands for the Banach space of (equivalence classes of) measurable functions f satisfying $\int_D |f(x)|^p \,\mathrm{d}x < \infty$, and $L^\infty(D)$ is the Banach space of functions that are essentially bounded in D. The standard Sobolev space of functions on D whose generalized derivatives up to order k are in $L^p(D)$, equipped with its natural norm, is denoted by $\mathcal{W}^{k,p}(D)$, $k \ge 0$, $p \ge 1$.

In general, if $\mathcal{X}$ is a space of real-valued functions on D, $\mathcal{X}_{\mathrm{loc}}$ consists of all functions f such that $f\varphi \in \mathcal{X}$ for every $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(D)$, the space of smooth functions on D with compact support. In this manner we obtain for example the space $\mathcal{W}^{2,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(D)$.

We adopt the notation $\partial_i := \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$ and $\partial_{ij} := \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}$ for $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$. We often use the standard summation rule that repeated subscripts and superscripts are summed from 1 through d. For example,

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\, a^{ij}\partial_{ij}\varphi + b^i \partial_i \varphi \;:=\; \tfrac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^d a^{ij} \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} + \sum_{i=1}^d b^i \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i}\,.$$

2. Setting and main results

The following assumptions (A1)-(A3) on the controlled diffusion (2.1) will be in effect throughout this article unless otherwise mentioned.

(A1) *Local Lipschitz continuity:* The function

$$b \;=\; \big[b^1, \dots, b^d\big]^{\mathsf{T}} : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{U}_1 \times \mathbb{U}_2 \to \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \sigma \;=\; \big[\sigma^{ij}\big] : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$$

are locally Lipschitz in x (uniformly in the other two variables for b) with a Lipschitz constant $C_R > 0$ depending on $R > 0$. In other words, we have

$$|b(x,u) - b(y,u)| + \|\sigma(x) - \sigma(y)\| \;\le\; C_R\,|x-y| \qquad \forall\, x, y \in B_R\,,\; u \in \mathbb{U}_1 \times \mathbb{U}_2\,.$$

We also assume that the action spaces $\mathbb{U}_i, i = 1, 2$, are compact metric spaces and b is jointly continuous in (x, u).

(A2) *Affine growth condition:* b and σ satisfy a global growth condition of the form

$$\sup_{u\in\mathbb{U}_1\times\mathbb{U}_2} \langle b(x,u),x\rangle^+ + \|\sigma(x)\|^2 \;\le\; C_0\big(1+|x|^2\big) \qquad \forall\, x\in\mathbb{R}^d,$$

for some constant $C_0>0$, where $\|\sigma\|^2 \;:=\; \operatorname{trace}\big(\sigma\sigma^{\mathsf{T}}\big)$.

(A3) *Nondegeneracy:* For each $R>0$, it holds that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^d a^{ij}(x)\xi_i\xi_j \;\ge\; C_R^{-1}|\xi|^2 \qquad \forall\, x\in B_R\,,$$

and for all $\xi=(\xi_1,\dots,\xi_d)^{\mathsf{T}}\in\mathbb{R}^d$, where $a:=\sigma\sigma^{\mathsf{T}}$.

Set of all probability measures on $\mathbb{U}_i$ is denoted by $\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_i$, $i=1,2$. In our control model we have two players and $\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_i$ denotes the *relaxed* action space for the the i-th player, $i=1,2$. We extend the drift $b:\mathbb{R}^d\times\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_1\times\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2\to\mathbb{R}^d$ as follows: for $\nu_i\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_i$, $i=1,2$,

$$b(x,\nu_1,\nu_2)=\int_{\mathbb{U}_1\times\mathbb{U}_2} b(x,u_1,u_2)\,\nu_1(\mathrm{d}u_1)\,\nu_2(\mathrm{d}u_2).$$

It is easy to verify that the extended drift satisfies (A1)-(A2) with $\mathbb{U}_i$ replaced by $\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_i$, $i=1,2$. One major advantage of this extension is that $b(x,\cdot,\cdot):\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_1\times\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2\to\mathbb{R}^d$ becomes coordinate-wise convex. This extension would play a key role in the selection of saddle point below.

The controlled stochastic differential equation (SDE) is given by

$$\mathrm{d}X_s \;=\; b(X_s,U_s^1,U_s^2)\,\mathrm{d}s+\sigma(X_s)\,\mathrm{d}W_s, \tag{2.1}$$

where W is a standard d-dimensional Wiener process on some complete, filtered probability space $(\Omega,\mathfrak{F},\{\mathfrak{F}_t\},\mathbb{P})$, and U^i is an $\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_i$ valued process satisfying following admissibility condition: for $s<t$, the completion of $\sigma\{U_r^i,W_r\;:\;r\le s,i=1,2\}$ relative to $\{\mathfrak{F},\mathbb{P}\}$ is independent of W_t-W_s. Let us clarify that we do not fix any probability space a priori and this is an important technical point which allow as to consider a fairly large class of *admissible* control. It is well known that given a complete, filtered probability space $(\Omega,\mathfrak{F},\{\mathfrak{F}_t\},\mathbb{P})$ with a Wiener process W, under (A1)–(A3), for any progressively measurable (U^1,U^2) there exists a unique solution of (2.1) [2, Theorem 2.2.4]. We define the family of operators $\mathcal{L}^{\tilde u}:\mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)\mapsto\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, where $\tilde u\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_1\times\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2$ plays the role of a parameter, by

$$\mathcal{L}^{\tilde u}f(x) \;=\; \tfrac12\, a^{ij}(x)\,\partial_{ij}f(x)+b^i(x,\tilde u_1,\tilde u_2)\,\partial_i f(x)\,,\quad \tilde u=(\tilde u_1,\tilde u_2)\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_1\times\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2\,. \tag{2.2}$$

By a stationary Markov control for the i-th player we mean a control of the form $U_t^i=v_i(X_t)$ for a Borel measurable map $v_i:\mathbb{R}^d\to\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_i$, $i=1,2$. By an abuse of notation we will refer to v_i as stationary Markov control. Let $\mathfrak{U}_i^{\mathrm{SM}}$ denote the set of all stationary Markov controls for the i-th player. It is well known that under $v_i\in\mathfrak{U}_i^{\mathrm{SM}}$ (2.1) has a unique strong solution [21]. Moreover, under $v=(v_1,v_2)\in\mathfrak{U}_1^{\mathrm{SM}}\times\mathfrak{U}_2^{\mathrm{SM}}$, the process X is strong Markov, and we denote its transition kernel by $P_v^t(x,\cdot\,)$. It also follows from the work in [12] that under $v\in\mathfrak{U}_1^{\mathrm{SM}}\times\mathfrak{U}_2^{\mathrm{SM}}$, the transition probabilities of X have densities which are locally Hölder continuous. Thus $\mathcal{L}_v$ defined by

$$\mathcal{L}_v f(x) \;=\; \tfrac12\, a^{ij}(x)\,\partial_{ij}f(x)+b^i\big(x,v_1(x),v_2(x)\big)\,\partial_i f(x)\,,\quad v=(v_1,v_2)\in\mathfrak{U}_1^{\mathrm{SM}}\times\mathfrak{U}_2^{\mathrm{SM}}\,,$$

for $f\in\mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, is the generator of a strongly-continuous semigroup on $\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which is strong Feller. When $v\in\mathfrak{U}_1^{\mathrm{SM}}\times\mathfrak{U}_2^{\mathrm{SM}}$ we use v as subscript in $\mathcal{L}_v$ to distinguish it from $\mathcal{L}^{\tilde u}$,

$\tilde{u} \in \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_1 \times \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2$, defined in the preceding paragraph. We let $\mathbb{P}_x^v$ denote the probability measure and $\mathbb{E}_x^v$ the expectation operator on the canonical space of the process under the control $v \in \mathfrak{U}_1^{\mathrm{SM}} \times \mathfrak{U}_2^{\mathrm{SM}}$, conditioned on the process X starting from $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ at $t = 0$. For every i the set $\mathfrak{U}_i^{\mathrm{SM}}$ is metrizable with a compact metric [2, Section 2.2.4], [13]. In fact, $v_n \to v$ in $\mathfrak{U}_i^{\mathrm{SM}}$ if and only if

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) \int_{\mathbb{U}_i} g(x,u_i) v_n(\mathrm{d}u_i|x)\,\mathrm{d}x \xrightarrow{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x) \int_{\mathbb{U}_i} g(x,u_i) v(\mathrm{d}u_i|x)\,\mathrm{d}x,$$

for all $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $g \in \mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{U}_i)$. Recall that $\tau(D)$ denotes the first exit time of the process X from domain D. A pair stationary Markov controls $(v_1, v_2) \in \mathfrak{U}_1^{\mathrm{SM}} \times \mathfrak{U}_2^{\mathrm{SM}}$ is said to be stable if the associated process is positive recurrent i.e., $\mathbb{E}_x^v[\tau(D^c)] < \infty$ for all $x \in D^c$. It is known that for a non-degenerate diffusion the property of positive recurrence is independent of domain, i.e., if it holds for one domain D then it also holds for every domain [2, Theorem 2.6.10].

Let us now introduce the set of all admissible controls for our game problem. We follow the approach of [14, 25]. A control is called a *feedback control* if it is progressively measurable with respect to the natural filtration generated by X. More precisely, we say U^i is of feedback form if for some measurable $f_i : [0,\infty) \times \mathcal{C}([0,\infty) : \mathbb{R}^d) \to \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_i$ we have $U_t^i = f_i(t, X_{[0,t]}), i = 1, 2$. It should be noted that stationary Markov controls are also feedback controls. The set of all feedback controls for the i-th player is denoted by $\mathfrak{U}_i, i = 1, 2$. We also refer the members of $\mathfrak{U}_i$ as admissible controls. By [2, Theorem 2.2.11] we know that for any $(U^1, U^2) \in \mathfrak{U}_1 \times \mathfrak{U}_2$ (2.1) has a unique weak solution.

A Borel measurable function $\ell : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be inf-compact if for any $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$ the set $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \ell(x) \le \kappa\}$ is compact. It is clear that for any inf-compact function ℓ we have $\lim_{|x|\to\infty} \ell(x) = \infty$. For a locally bounded function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ and $(U^1, U^2) \in \mathfrak{U}_1 \times \mathfrak{U}_2$, the risk-sensitive average is defined to be

$$\mathcal{E}_x(f, U^1, U^2) = \limsup_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \log \mathbb{E}_x \left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^T f(X_s, U_s^1, U_s^2)\,\mathrm{d}s} \right], \text{ and } \mathcal{E}(f, U^1, U^2) = \inf_{x\in\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{E}_x(f, U^1, U^2).$$

The running cost function for our problem is given by a continuous function $c : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{U}_1 \times \mathbb{U}_2 \to \mathbb{R}_+$ which is locally Lipschitz continuous in its first argument uniformly with respect to $u \in \mathbb{U}_1 \times \mathbb{U}_2$. Without loss of generality we assume that c is non-constant function. As earlier we extend c over $\mathbb{R}^d \times \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_1 \times \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2$ as follows: for $\nu_i \in \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_i$, $i = 1, 2$

$$c(x, \nu_1, \nu_2) = \int_{\mathbb{U}_1 \times \mathbb{U}_2} c(x, u_1, u_2)\, \nu_1(\mathrm{d}u_1)\, \nu_2(\mathrm{d}u_2).$$

In this article the cost criterion is given by $\mathcal{E}_x(c, U^1, U^2)$, and for notational economy we shall drop the notation c and denote it by $\mathcal{E}_x(U^1, U^2)$. We also define

$$\mathcal{J}_{\inf}(x, U^2) = \inf_{U^1\in\mathfrak{U}_1} \mathcal{E}_x(U^1, U^2), \quad \mathcal{J}_{\sup}(x, U^1) = \sup_{U^2\in\mathfrak{U}_2} \mathcal{E}_x(U^1, U^2). \tag{2.3}$$

Therefore the upper and lower value of the game are respectively defined as

$$\bar{\Lambda} = \inf_{U^1\in\mathfrak{U}_1} \mathcal{J}_{\sup}(x, U^1) = \inf_{U^1\in\mathfrak{U}_1} \sup_{U^2\in\mathfrak{U}_2} \mathcal{E}_x(U^1, U^2),$$

$$\underline{\Lambda} = \sup_{U^2\in\mathfrak{U}_2} \mathcal{J}_{\inf}(x, U^2) = \sup_{U^2\in\mathfrak{U}_2} \inf_{U^1\in\mathfrak{U}_1} \mathcal{E}_x(U^1, U^2).$$

The game is said to have a value if we have

$$\bar{\Lambda} = \underline{\Lambda} = \Lambda \text{ (say)}.$$

The reader might have observed that we do not write Λ (or $\bar{\Lambda}$, $\underline{\Lambda}$) as a function of x. We show that under certain stability hypothesis (assumed below), the value of the game is independent of x. Let us now introduce two set of stability assumptions that will be used in this article

Condition 2.1. There exists a positive function $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\inf_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{V} > 0$, and a constant $\gamma > 0$ such that

$$\max_{u \in \mathbb{U}_1 \times \mathbb{U}_2} \mathcal{L}^u \mathcal{V} \;\le\; \beta \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}} - \gamma \mathcal{V}, \tag{2.4}$$

for some compact $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and constant β. Moreover, the cost function c is bounded, and

$$\|c\|_\infty \;<\; \gamma. \tag{2.5}$$

Example 2.1. Suppose $a = \mathrm{Id}$ and

$$b(x,u) \cdot x \;\le\; -|x|, \quad \text{outside a compact set } \mathcal{K}_1 .$$

Taking $\mathcal{V}(x) = \exp(|x|)$ for $|x| \ge 1$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}\mathcal{V} \;=\; \Big(\frac{d-1}{2|x|} + \frac{1}{2} + b(x,u) \cdot \frac{x}{|x|}\Big)\mathcal{V} \;\le\; \Big(\frac{d-1}{2|x|} - \frac{1}{2}\Big)\mathcal{V}, \quad \text{for } |x| \ge 1 .$$

Note that $\mathcal{V}$ in Example 2.1 is inf-compact. Below we produce an example where $\mathcal{V}$ is not inf-compact.

Example 2.2. Let $d = 1$, $\sigma = \mathrm{Id}$ and $b(x,u) = -\mathrm{sgn}(x)|x|^2 + u$ where $u \in [0,1]$. Take $\mathcal{V}(x) = \frac{|x|}{1+|x|}$ for $|x| \ge 1$ and extend it in whole of $\mathbb{R}$ as a smooth function so that $\inf_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{V} > 0$. Then for any $\gamma \in (0,1)$ we can find a compact set $\mathcal{K}$ and a constant β such that

$$\sup_{u \in [0,1]} \mathcal{L}^u \mathcal{V} \;\le\; \beta \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}} - \gamma\, \mathcal{V}.$$

Condition 2.2. There exists positive functions $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\inf_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathcal{V} > 0$, and $\ell \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d), \ell$ inf-compact, such that

$$\sup_{u \in \mathbb{U}_1 \times \mathbb{U}_2} (\mathcal{L}^u \mathcal{V}) \;\le\; \beta \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{K}} - \ell\, \mathcal{V}, \tag{2.6}$$

for some constant β and a compact set $\mathcal{K}$. Moreover, the cost function c belongs to $\mathcal{C}_\ell$ where

$$\mathcal{C}_\ell = \Big\{ c : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{U}_1 \times \mathbb{U}_2 \to \mathbb{R}_+ \text{ where } \limsup_{|x| \to \infty} \tfrac{\max_{u \in \mathbb{U}_1 \times \mathbb{U}_2} c(x,u)}{\ell(x)} \;\le\; \theta \text{ for some } \theta \in (0,1) \Big\}.$$

ℓ being inf-compact it is easy to see that for $c \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$, $\big(\ell - \max_{u \in \mathbb{U}_1 \times \mathbb{U}_2} c(x,u)\big)$ is inf-compact. Let us remark that if a, b are bounded functions one can not expect (2.6) to hold. See for instance the Remark 3.3 in [4].

Example 2.3. Let σ be bounded and $b : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{U} \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be such that

$$\langle b(x,u) - b(0,u), x \rangle \;\le\; -\kappa\, |x|^\alpha, \quad \text{for some } \alpha \in (1,2], \quad (x,u) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{U} .$$

Then, $\mathcal{V}(x) = \exp(|x|^{\theta\alpha})$ for $|x| \geq 1$, satisfies (2.6) for sufficiently small $\theta > 0$, and $\ell \sim |x|^{2\alpha-1}$. Note that $\alpha = 2$, $\sigma = \mathrm{Id}$ is considered in [18] in the context of minimization problem with risk-sensitive criterion.

Let us now state the main result of this article

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that either Condition 2.1 or Condition 2.2 holds. Then there exists an eigenpair $(V, \Lambda) \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{R}$, $V > 0$, that satisfies*

$$\max_{\tilde{u}_2 \in \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2} \min_{\tilde{u}_1 \in \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_1} \Big(\frac{1}{2} a^{ij} \partial_{ij} V + b(x, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) \cdot \nabla V + c(x, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) V \Big) \;=\; \Lambda\, V, \quad V(0) = 1. \tag{2.7}$$

Moreover, we have the following

(i) *Λ in (2.7) is the value of game i.e., $\bar{\Lambda} = \underline{\Lambda} = \Lambda$.*

(ii) *If v_2^* is an outer maximizing selector of*

$$\max_{\tilde{u}_2 \in \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2} \min_{\tilde{u}_1 \in \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_1} \Big(\frac{1}{2} a^{ij} \partial_{ij} V + b(x, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) \cdot \nabla V + c(x, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) V \Big) = \Lambda\, V, \tag{2.8}$$

and v_1^* is an outer minimizing selector of

$$\min_{\tilde{u}_1 \in \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_1} \max_{\tilde{u}_2 \in \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2} \Big(\frac{1}{2} a^{ij} \partial_{ij} V + b(x, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) \cdot \nabla V + c(x, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) V \Big) = \Lambda\, V, \tag{2.9}$$

then the pair $(v_1^*, v_2^*) \in \mathfrak{U}_1^{\mathrm{SM}} \times \mathfrak{U}_2^{\mathrm{SM}}$ is a saddle point strategy i.e.,

$$\mathcal{E}(v_1^*, U^2) \leq \mathcal{E}(v_1^*, v_2^*) = \Lambda \leq \mathcal{E}(U^1, v_2^*), \quad \forall\, U^1 \in \mathfrak{U}_1, \text{ and } U^2 \in \mathfrak{U}_2.$$

(iii) *The eigenfunction V is unique in the class $\mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, provided $V(0) = 1$.*

(iv) *If $(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2) \in \mathfrak{U}_1^{\mathrm{SM}} \times \mathfrak{U}_2^{\mathrm{SM}}$ is a saddle point strategy in the above sense then $\hat{v}_1$ is an outer minimizing selector of (2.9) and $\hat{v}_2$ is an outer maximizing selector of (2.8).*

For existence of measurable selector we refer the readers to [1, Chapter 18]. Such existence of measurable selector will be used in several places in this article. Also note that by [17, Thorem 3], the left hand sides of (2.8) and (2.9) are equal. The proof of Theorem 2.1 is established in Section 4 below.

Before we conclude this section let us recall the definition of principal eigenvalue from [8]. Let

$$L\varphi = \tfrac{1}{2}\, \hat{a}^{ij}(x)\, \partial_{ij}\varphi(x) + \hat{b}^i(x)\, \partial_i \varphi(x) \;+ \hat{c}(x)\varphi,$$

where $\hat{b}, \hat{c}$ are locally finite, Borel measurable functions, $\hat{a}$ is continuous and satisfies (A3). Then the principal eigenvalue of L is defined to be

$$\lambda^* = \inf\{\lambda \,:\, \exists\, \varphi \in \mathcal{W}^{2,d}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d),\, \varphi > 0, \text{ and } L\varphi - \lambda\varphi \leq 0, \text{ a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^d\}. \tag{2.10}$$

The following result is proved in [4, Theorem 3.2 and 3.3].

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose that either Conditon 2.1 or Condition 2.2 holds. Then for any $v = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathfrak{U}_1^{\mathrm{SM}} \times \mathfrak{U}_2^{\mathrm{SM}}$, the principal eigenvalue of the operator*

$$\mathcal{L}_v \varphi = \tfrac{1}{2}\, a^{ij}(x)\, \partial_{ij}\varphi(x) + b^i(x, v(x))\, \partial_i \varphi(x) \;+ c(x, v(x))\varphi,$$

is $\mathcal{E}_x(v_1, v_2)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

3. **A maximization problem**

In this section we study a maximization problem which will play a key role in our analysis. Let $r : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{U}_2 \to \mathbb{R}_+$ and $b : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{U}_2 \to \mathbb{R}^d$ be Borel measurable functions that are locally finite and continuous in u_2 for every fixed x. Moreover, b and σ satisfies (A2)-(A3). We also assume that σ satisfies (A1). As earlier we consider the relaxed action space $\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2$ and extend b, r over $\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2$. Then the main result of this section is the following

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that one of the following holds.*

(H1) (2.4) *holds and* $\|r\|_\infty < \gamma$.

(H2) (2.6) *holds with some continuous, inf-compact* ℓ *and*

$$\limsup_{|x|\to\infty} \frac{\max_{u_2\in\mathbb{U}_2} r(x,u_2)}{\ell(x)} \le \theta \in (0,1)\,. \tag{3.1}$$

Then there exists $(V, \lambda_{\max}) \in \mathcal{W}^{2,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{R}$, $p \in (1,\infty)$, *with* $V > 0$ *and*

$$\max_{\tilde{u}_2\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2} \Big(\tfrac{1}{2}\, a^{ij}(x)\, \partial_{ij} V(x) + b^i(x,\tilde{u}_2)\, \partial_i V(x) + r(x,\tilde{u}_2) V \Big) = \lambda_{\max}\, V(x) \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{3.2}$$

Moreover, we have the following:

(i) *For all* $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, *we have*

$$\lambda_{\max} = \sup_{U^2\in\mathfrak{U}_2} \mathcal{E}_x(r, U^2) = \sup_{U^2\in\mathfrak{U}_2} \limsup_{T\to\infty} \frac{1}{T} \log \mathbb{E}_x \left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^T r(X_s, U^2_s)\,\mathrm{d}s} \right].$$

(ii) *Any measurable selector of* (3.2) *is an optimal stationary Markov control, i.e., if* v_2^* *is a measurable maximizer of* (3.2) *then we have* $\lambda_{\max} = \mathcal{E}_x(r, v_2^*)$.

(iii) *The solution of* (3.2) *is unique in the class* $\mathcal{W}^{2,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $p \in (1,\infty)$, *provided* $V(0) = 1$.

(iv) *Any optimal stationary Markov control is a measurable selector of* (3.2).

A similar minimization problem with long-run average of risk sensitive cost has been studied in [4, Theorem 4.1 and 4.2]. As we mentioned earlier it is not obvious that one can change a maximization problem to a minimization problem of same type. Therefore proof Theorem 3.1 does not follow from [4]. We think Theorem 3.1 would be of independent interest. The proof of Theorem 3.1 is divided in several lemmas.

In what follows B_n denotes the open ball of radius n around 0. Following result follows from [26, Theorem 1.1 and Remark 3]

Lemma 3.1. *There exists a (unique) positive* $\varphi_n \in \mathcal{W}^{2,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(B_n) \cap \mathcal{C}(\bar{B}_n)$, $p \in (1,\infty)$, *and* $\alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}$ *such that* $\varphi_n(0) = 1$ *and*

$$\max_{\tilde{u}\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2} \Big(\mathcal{L}^{\tilde{u}_2}\varphi_n + r(x,\tilde{u}_2)\varphi_n \Big) = \alpha_n\, \varphi_n(x), \quad \text{a.e. in } B_n, \quad \varphi_n = 0, \ \text{ on } \partial B_n. \tag{3.3}$$

Moreover, $\alpha_n < \alpha_{n+1}$ *for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $v^*_{2,n}$ be a measurable selector of (3.3). Then

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\, a^{ij}(x)\, \partial_{ij}\varphi_n(x) + b^i(x, v^*_{2,n})\, \partial_i \varphi_n(x) + r(x, v^*_{2,n})\varphi_n = \alpha_n\, \varphi_n, \quad \text{a.e. in } B_n. \tag{3.4}$$

Since $\varphi_n(0) = 1$, by Harnack's inequality [20, Corollary 9.25] and (3.4) we have for any compact set $K \subset B_n$,

$$\sup_K \varphi_n \;\le\; C(K), \tag{3.5}$$

for some constant $C(K)$, not depending on n but depends on K and the constants in (A1)-(A3). Therefore using standard Sobolev estimate [20, Theorem 9.11] in (3.4) we obtain $\{\varphi_n : n \ge 1\}$ uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{W}^{2,p}(K), p > d$. By a standard diagonalization argument we can extract a subsequence of $\{\varphi_n : n \ge 1\}$ that converges to some $V \in \mathcal{W}^{2,p}_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $p > 1$, strongly in $\mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\alpha \in (0,1)$, and weakly in $\mathcal{W}^{2,p}_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $p > 1$. Therefore we have the following lemma

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that either (H1) or (H2) of Theorem 3.1 holds. Then the sequence $\{\alpha_n : n \ge 1\}$ is bounded above. Moreover, if $(V, \lambda_{\max})$ is any sub-sequential limit of (φ_n, α_n), then we have*

$$\max_{\tilde{u}_2 \in \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2} \Big(\mathcal{L}^{\tilde{u}_2} V(x) + r(x, \tilde{u}_2) V(x) \Big) \;=\; \lambda_{\max} V(x), \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^d, \text{ and } V > 0. \tag{3.6}$$

Proof. Let us first show that $\{\alpha_n\}$ is bounded above. Let $v^*_{2,n}$ be a measurable selector of (3.3). Extend the Markov control in $\mathbb{R}^d$ be settings $v^*_{2,n}(x) = u_2$ for all $x \in B_n^c$ where $u_2 \in \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2$ is fixed. Let $\tau_n = \tau(B_n)$. Then appying Itô-Krylov formula [24, p. 122] to (3.4) we have, for $x \in B_1$

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_n(x) &= \mathbb{E}_x^{v^*_{2,n}} \left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^T [r(X_s, v^*_{2,n}(X_s)) - \alpha_n] \, \mathrm{d}s} \varphi_n(X_T) \mathbb{1}_{\{T < \tau_n\}} \right] \\ &\le \; \|\varphi_n\|_\infty \; \mathbb{E}_x^{v^*_{2,n}} \left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^T [r(X_s, v^*_{2,n}(X_s)) - \alpha_n] \, \mathrm{d}s} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore taking logarithm on both sides, diving by T and letting $T \to \infty$ we get

$$\alpha_n \le \mathcal{E}_x(r, v^*_{2,n}). \tag{3.7}$$

Under condition (H1) we have r bounded and thus

$$\sup_{U^2 \in \mathfrak{U}_2} \mathcal{E}_x(r, U^2) \le \|r\|_\infty < \infty.$$

Suppose condition (H2) holds. It is easy to see from (2.6) that

$$\sup_{U^2 \in \mathfrak{U}_2} \mathcal{E}_x(\ell, U^2) \le \tfrac{\beta}{\min_{\mathcal{K}} \mathcal{V}}.$$

By (3.1), $\max_{\tilde{u}_2 \in \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2} r(\cdot, \tilde{u}_2) \le \kappa + \ell(\cdot)$ for some positive κ. Hence

$$\sup_{U^2 \in \mathfrak{U}_2} \mathcal{E}_x(r, U^2) \le \kappa + \tfrac{\beta}{\min_{\mathcal{K}} \mathcal{V}}.$$

Combining these with (3.7) we have

$$\alpha_n \le \kappa_1, \quad \text{for all } n \ge 1, \text{ and for some constant } \kappa_1. \tag{3.8}$$

Hence first part of the lemma follows from (3.8).

Since $\{\alpha_n \,:\, n \geq 1\}$ is bounded above, $\lambda_{\max} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \alpha_n$ exists. Let V be a sub-sequential limit of φ_n as obtained above. Since $\varphi_n \to V$ in $\mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we have, for any compact set K,

$$\sup_{x\in K}\Big| \max_{\tilde{u}_2\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2} (b(x,\tilde{u}_2)\cdot\nabla\varphi_n(x)+r(x,\tilde{u}_2)\varphi_n(x)) - \max_{\tilde{u}_2\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2} (b(x,\tilde{u}_2)\cdot\nabla V(x)+r(x,\tilde{u}_2)V(x))\Big| \tag{3.9}$$

tending to 0, as $n\to\infty$. Now let χ be a smooth function with compact support. Then using the observation in (3.9) and using (3.3) we obtain, as $n\to\infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\tfrac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a^{ij}(x)\partial_{ij}V(x)\chi(x)\,\mathrm{d}x + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \max_{\tilde{u}_2\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2} (b(x,\tilde{u}_2)\cdot\nabla V(x) + r(x,\tilde{u}_2)V(x))\chi(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\qquad = \lambda_{\max}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} V(x)\chi(x)\,\mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Since χ is arbitrary and $V\in\mathcal{W}^{2,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d), p>1$, (3.10) implies that

$$\max_{\tilde{u}_2\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2}\Big(\mathcal{L}^{\tilde{u}_2}V(x) + r(x,\tilde{u}_2)V(x)\Big) \;=\; \lambda_{\max}\,V(x), \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^d.$$

It is easy to see that $V\geq 0$ and $V(0)=1$. Therefore by an application of Harnack's inequality in the above equation we get $V>0$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Hence the proof. □

Next we show that V has a stochastic representation.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 hold. Then for any sub-sequential limit V, as obtained in Lemma 3.2, there exists a compact set $\mathcal{B}$ such that for any measurable selector v_2^* of* (3.6) *and any compact ball $\mathcal{B}_1\supset\mathcal{B}$ we have*

$$V(x) \;=\; \mathbb{E}_x^{v_2^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\breve{\tau}_1}[r(X_s,v_2^*(X_s))-\lambda_{\max}]\,\mathrm{d}s}V(X_{\breve{\tau}_1})\right], \quad \textit{for} \quad x\in\mathcal{B}_1^c, \tag{3.11}$$

where $\breve{\tau}_1=\tau(\mathcal{B}_1^c)$.

Proof. Let us first argue that $\lambda_{\max}$ is non-negative. If not, let us assume that $\lambda_{\max}<0$. Let v_2^* be a measurable selector of (3.6). Existence of such a measurable selector is assured by [1, Theorem 18.13]. Thus we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{v_2^*}V(x) + r(x,v_2^*(x)) \;=\; \lambda_{\max}V(x), \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{3.12}$$

Applying Itô-Krylov formula [24, p. 122] to (3.12) we obtain for any $T>0$ and for any n, that

$$V(x) \;=\; \mathbb{E}_x^{v_2^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\tau(B_1^c)\wedge T\wedge\tau_n}[r(X_s,v_2^*(X_s))-\lambda_{\max}]\,\mathrm{d}s}V(X_{\tau(B_1^c)\wedge T\wedge\tau_n})\right], \quad \text{for} \quad x\in B_1^c. \tag{3.13}$$

Letting $T\to\infty$, and $n\to\infty$ in (3.13) and applying Fatou's lemma twice we get

$$V(x) \;\geq\; \mathbb{E}_x^{v_2^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\tau(B_1^c)}[r(X_s,v_2^*(X_s))-\lambda_{\max}]\,\mathrm{d}s}V(X_{\tau(B_1^c)})\right] \;\geq\; \min_{\bar{B}_1} V,$$

where we have used the fact $(r-\lambda_{\max})\geq 0$. Therefore we have $\min_{\mathbb{R}^d} V>0$. Again a further application of Itô-Krylov formula [24, p. 122] to (3.12), followed by Fatou's lemma, gives us

$$V(x) \;\geq\; \mathbb{E}_x^{v_2^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{T}[r(X_s,v_2^*(X_s))-\lambda_{\max}]\,\mathrm{d}s}V(X_T)\right] \;\geq\; \min_{\mathbb{R}^d} V\;\mathbb{E}_x^{v_2^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{T}[r(X_s,v_2^*(X_s))-\lambda_{\max}]\,\mathrm{d}s}\right].$$

Now taking logarithm on both sides, diving by T and letting $T \to \infty$ we obtain

$$\lambda_{\max} \;\geq\; \mathcal{E}_x(r, v_2^*) \;\geq\; 0.$$

But this is contradicting the fact that $\lambda_{\max} < 0$. Hence we have $\lambda_{\max} \geq 0$.

First we note that there exists a compact set $\mathcal{B}$ and $\hat{\theta} \in (0,1)$ such that under (H1)

$$\Big(\max_{u\in\mathbb{U}_2} r(x,u) - \lambda_{\max}\Big) \;<\; \hat{\theta}\,\gamma, \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{B}^c, \tag{3.14}$$

and under condition (H2),

$$\Big(\max_{u\in\mathbb{U}_2} r(x,u) - \lambda_{\max}\Big) \;<\; \hat{\theta}\,\ell(x), \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathcal{B}^c. \tag{3.15}$$

(3.14) follows from the fact $0 \leq \lambda_{\max} \leq \|r\|_\infty < \gamma$ whereas (3.15) follows from (3.1). Since $\alpha_n \to \lambda_{\max}$ it is easy to see that we can find $\hat{\theta} \in (0,1)$ such that (3.14) (and (3.15)) holds true when $\lambda_{\max}$ is replaced by α_n for all large n. Let $\check{\tau}$ denote the hitting time to $\mathcal{B}$. Without loss of generality we may assume $\mathcal{B} \supset \mathcal{K}$ where $\mathcal{K}$ is same as in (2.4) and (2.6). We give the proof using (3.14), and the proof using (3.15) follows by repeating the same argument. φ_n being positive we note that α_n is the principal eigenvalue of the elliptic operator on the LHS of (3.4). Thus using (3.4) and stochastic representation from [3, Lemma 2.10(i)] we have, for $x \in \mathcal{B}^c$ and $\mathcal{B} \subset B_n$, for all n sufficiently large

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_n(x) \;&=\; \mathbb{E}_x^{v_{2,n}^*}\Big[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\check{\tau}}[r(X_s,v_{2,n}^*(X_s))-\alpha_n]\,\mathrm{d}s}\varphi_n(X_{\check{\tau}_1})\mathbb{1}_{\{\check{\tau}<\tau_n\}}\Big] \\
&\leq\; \sup_{\mathcal{B}}\varphi_n\;\mathbb{E}_x^{v_{2,n}^*}\Big[\mathrm{e}^{\hat{\theta}\gamma\check{\tau}}\Big] \\
&\leq\; \sup_{\mathcal{B}}\varphi_n\,\Big(\mathbb{E}_x^{v_{2,n}^*}\Big[\mathrm{e}^{\gamma\check{\tau}}\Big]\Big)^{\hat{\theta}} \\
&\leq\; \sup_{\mathcal{B}}\varphi_n\,\frac{1}{\min_{\mathcal{B}}\mathcal{V}^{\hat{\theta}}}\Big(\mathbb{E}_x^{v_{2,n}^*}\Big[\mathrm{e}^{\gamma\check{\tau}}\mathcal{V}(X_{\check{\tau}})\Big]\Big)^{\hat{\theta}} \\
&\leq\; \kappa_2\,(\mathcal{V}(x))^{\hat{\theta}},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

for some constant κ_2, where the last inequality follows applying Itô's formula to (2.4). Note that κ_2 can be chosen independent of n, by (3.5) thanks to the Harnack's inequality. Now we proceed to show the stochastic representation (3.11). Fix the compact set $\mathcal{B}$ as chosen in (3.14) and (3.15). Let $\mathcal{B}_1$ be a compact ball containing $\mathcal{B}$ and $\check{\tau}_1 = \tau(\mathcal{B}_1^c)$. As earlier we show (3.11) under assertion (H1) and the proof under condition (H2) would be analogous. Applying Itô-Krylov formula to (3.12) we obtain, for any $T > 0$,

$$V(x) \;=\; \mathbb{E}_x^{v_2^*}\Big[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\check{\tau}_1\wedge\tau_n\wedge T}(r(X_s,v_2^*(X_s))-\lambda_{\max})\,\mathrm{d}s}\,V(X_{\check{\tau}_1\wedge\tau_n\wedge T})\Big], \quad x \in \mathcal{B}_1^c\cap B_n,\ \mathcal{B}_1 \subset B_n\,, \tag{3.17}$$

where $\tau_n = \tau(B_n)$ denotes the exit time from the ball B_n. Since

$$\mathbb{E}_x^{v_2^*}\Big[\mathrm{e}^{\gamma\check{\tau}_1}\Big] \;<\; \infty, \quad \text{for } x \in \mathcal{B}_1^c,$$

by (2.4), and V is bounded in $\mathcal{B}_1^c \cap B_n$, for every fixed n, letting $T \to \infty$ in (3.17), we have

$$V(x) \;=\; \mathbb{E}_x^{v_2^*}\Big[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\check{\tau}_1\wedge\tau_n}(r(X_s,v_2^*(X_s))-\lambda_{\max})\,\mathrm{d}s}\,V(X_{\check{\tau}\wedge\tau_n})\Big], \quad x \in \mathcal{B}_1^c\cap B_n. \tag{3.18}$$

On the other hand, since

$$\mathbb{E}_x^{v_2^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\gamma(\check{\tau}_1\wedge\tau_n)}\right] = \mathbb{E}_x^{v_2^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\gamma\,\check{\tau}_1}\,\mathbb{1}_{\{\check{\tau}_1<\tau_n\}}\right] + \mathbb{E}_x^{v_2^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\gamma\,\tau_n}\,\mathbb{1}_{\{\check{\tau}_1>\tau_n\}}\right],$$

by dominated convergence theorem we have

$$\mathbb{E}_x^{v_2^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\gamma\,\tau_n}\,\mathbb{1}_{\{\check{\tau}_1>\tau_n\}}\right] \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{} 0, \quad \text{for } x\in\mathcal{B}_1^c. \tag{3.19}$$

We denote by $\Gamma(n,m)=\{x\in\partial B_n \,:\, V(x)\ge m\}$ for $m\ge 1$. Then using (3.19)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_x^{v_2^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\tau_n}(r(X_s,v_2^*(X_s))-\lambda_{\max})\,\mathrm{d}s}\,V(X_{\tau_n})\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_n<\check{\tau}_1\}}\right]\\
&\quad\le\ m\ \mathbb{E}_x^{v^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\gamma\,\tau_n}\,\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_n<\check{\tau}_1\}}\right] + \mathbb{E}_x^{v^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\gamma\,\tau_n}\,V(X_{\tau_n})\mathbb{1}_{\{x\in\Gamma(n,m)\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_n<\check{\tau}_1\}}\right]\\
&\quad\le\ m\ \mathbb{E}_x^{v^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\gamma\,\tau_n}\,\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_n<\check{\tau}_1\}}\right] + \kappa_2\ \mathbb{E}_x^{v^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\gamma\,\tau_n}\,(\mathcal{V}(X_{\tau_n}))^{\hat{\theta}}\mathbb{1}_{\{x\in\Gamma(n,m)\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_n<\check{\tau}_1\}}\right]\\
&\quad\le\ m\ \mathbb{E}_x^{v^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\gamma\,\tau_n}\,\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_n<\check{\tau}_1\}}\right] + \kappa_2\left[\frac{m}{\kappa_2}\right]^{\frac{\hat{\theta}-1}{\hat{\theta}}}\ \mathbb{E}_x^{v^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\gamma\,\tau_n}\,\mathcal{V}(X_{\tau_n})\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_n<\check{\tau}_1\}}\right]\\
&\quad\le\ m\ \mathbb{E}_x^{v^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\gamma\,\tau_n}\,\mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_n<\check{\tau}_1\}}\right] + \kappa_2\left[\frac{m}{\kappa_2}\right]^{\frac{\hat{\theta}-1}{\hat{\theta}}}\ \mathcal{V}(x)\\
&\quad\longrightarrow 0\,,
\end{aligned}$$

by letting $n\to\infty$ first and then letting $m\to\infty$. Therefore letting $n\to\infty$ in (3.18) we have (3.11). Note that under (H2) in order to make analogous argument we use the fact that

$$\mathbb{E}_x^{v_2^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\check{\tau}_1}\ell(X_t)dt}\right] \ <\ \infty, \quad \text{for } x\in\mathcal{B}_1^c,$$

by (2.6). □

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 3.1. The idea of the proof is the following : First we perturb the cost to a *norm-like* cost and prove Theorem 3.1 for the perturbed version. Then passing to the limit we show that the limiting eigenfunction also has stochastic representation (3.11) and we use Lemma 3.3 as a key ingredient in proving the result.

Let us now introduce the perturbation of r, denoted by r_m. For $m\in\mathbb{N}$, let $\zeta_m:\mathbb{R}^d\to[0,1]$ be a smooth function and satisfy $\zeta_m(x)=1$ in B_m, $\zeta_m(x)=0$ in B_{m+1}^c. For (H1), we choose δ small enough that so that $\|r\|_\infty+\delta<\gamma$ and define

$$r_m(x,\tilde{u}_2)=\zeta_m(x)r(x,u_2)+(1-\zeta_m(x))(\|r\|_\infty+\delta), \quad u_2\in\mathbb{U}_2.$$

For (H2), we define

$$r_m(x,\tilde{u}_2)=r(x,u_2)+\frac{1}{m}\ell(x), \quad u_2\in\mathbb{U}_2.$$

Choose m large enough so that r_m satisfies (3.1). Note that r_m is locally finite, continuous in $\tilde{u}_2$ for every fixed x. Also Lemma 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 holds with r replaced by r_m. Thus we can find an eigenpair $(V_m,\lambda_{2,m})\in\mathcal{W}^{2,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)\times\mathbb{R}$, $V_m>0$, and

$$\max_{\tilde{u}_2\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2}\Big(\mathcal{L}^{\tilde{u}_2}V_m(x)+r_m(x,\tilde{u}_2)V_m(x)\Big) \ =\ \lambda_{2,m}\,V_m(x), \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{3.20}$$

Lemma 3.4. *The solution V_m of (3.20) is bounded from below i.e., $\min_{\mathbb{R}^d} V_m > 0$. Moreover, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\sup_{U^2 \in \mathfrak{U}_2} \mathcal{E}_x(r_m, U^2) \;=\; \lambda_{2,m}. \tag{3.21}$$

Proof. Fix m. We claim that there exists a compact set K such that $\min_{u_2 \in \mathbb{U}_2} r_m(x, u_2) - \lambda_{2,m} \geq 0$ for all $x \in K^c$. This obvious when r_m is unbounded, as defined under condition (H2). Thus we prove the claim under condition (H1) where r_m is bounded. Note that $r_m = \|r\|_\infty + \delta$ for $x \in B^c_{m+1}$. Let $v^*_{2,m}$ be a measurable selector of (3.20). Then by Lemma 3.3, V_m has stochastic representation with some compact ball $\mathcal{B}_1$ and running cost r_m. From [4, Corollary 2.3] we know that only principal eigenvalue of the associated operator can have such representation. Therefore combing with Lemma 2.1 we get $\lambda_{2,m} = \mathcal{E}_x(r_m, v^*_{2,m})$ for all x. Again by strict monotonicity of principal eigenvalue [4, Theorem 3.3] under condition (H1) we have $\lambda_{2,m} < \|r\|_\infty + \delta$. Therefore choosing $K = \bar{B}_{m+1}$ we have our claim.

Without loss of generality we can choose K large enough to contain $\mathcal{B}$ where $\mathcal{B}$ is given by Lemma 3.3. Let $\breve{\tau}_K$ be the hitting time to K. Hence by (3.11)

$$V_m(x) \;=\; \mathbb{E}_x^{v^*_{2,m}} \left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\breve{\tau}_K} [r_m(X_s, v^*_2(X_s)) - \lambda_{2,m}]\,\mathrm{d}s} V_m(X_{\breve{\tau}_K}) \right] \;\geq\; \min_K V_m, \qquad \forall\, x \in K^c.$$

This proves that $\min_{\mathbb{R}^d} V_m = \min_K V_m > 0$. This proves first part of the lemma. To prove the second part consider $U^2 \in \mathfrak{U}_2$. Using (3.20) and Itô-Krylov formula [24, p. 122] we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} V_m(x) &\geq\; \mathbb{E}_x \left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^T [r_m(X_s, U^2(X_s)) - \lambda_{2,m}]\,\mathrm{d}s} V_m(X_T) \right] \\ &\geq\; \min_{\mathbb{R}^d} V_m \;\; \mathbb{E}_x \left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^T [r_m(X_s, U^2(X_s)) - \lambda_{2,m}]\,\mathrm{d}s} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Taking logarithm on both sides, dividing by T and letting $T \to \infty$, we get

$$\mathcal{E}_x(r_m, U^2) \;\leq\; \lambda_{2,m}.$$

U^2 in $\mathfrak{U}_2$ being arbitrary we have (3.21), using the above display and the fact $\lambda_{2,m} = \mathcal{E}_x(r_m, v^*_{2,m})$. □

Let us fix $V_m(0) = 1$. Recall that $v^*_{2,m}$ is a measurable selector of (3.20) i.e.

$$\mathcal{L}_{v^*_{2,m}} V_m(x) + r_m(x, v^*_{2.m}) V_m(x) \;=\; \lambda_{2,m}\, V_m(x), \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{3.22}$$

Therefore applying Harnack's inequality and Sobolev estimate, as earlier, on (3.22) it is easy to see that the sequence $\{V_m\}$ is uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{W}^{2,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d), p > 1$. Therefore we can extract a sub-sequence of $\{V_m\}$ that converges to some $V \in \mathcal{W}^{2,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d), p > 1$, weakly in $\mathcal{W}^{2,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $p > 1$, and strongly in $\mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\alpha \in (0,1)$. On the other hand $\{\lambda_{2,m} \,:\, m \geq 1\}$ is also a bounded sequence. This follows from (3.21) and by a similar reasoning as in Lemma 3.2. Let $(V, \lambda_{\max})$ be a sub-sequence of $(V_m, \lambda_{2,m})$ as $m \to \infty$. Then following the arguments of Lemma 3.2 we obtain

$$\max_{\tilde{u}_2 \in \bar{\mathbb{U}}_2} \Big(\mathcal{L}^{\tilde{u}_2} V(x) + r(x, \tilde{u}_2) V(x) \Big) \;=\; \lambda_{\max}\, V(x), \quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Again the arguments of Lemma 3.3 shows that $V_m(x) \le \kappa_2(\mathcal{V}(x))^{\hat\theta}$, $\hat\theta \in (0,1)$, uniformly in m outside a compact set (see (3.16)) and therefore, by an analogous calculation the limit V also has stochastic representation. Summarizing we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.5. *Let the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 hold. There exists an eigenpair $(V,\lambda_{\max}) \in \mathcal{W}^{2,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)\times\mathbb{R}$, $p\in(1,\infty)$, such that $V>0$, and*

$$\max_{\tilde u_2\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2}\Big(\tfrac12\, a^{ij}(x)\,\partial_{ij}V(x)+b^i(x,\tilde u_2)\,\partial_i V(x)\,+r(x,\tilde u_2)V\Big)=\lambda_{\max}\,V(x)\quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{3.23}$$

There exists a compact set $\mathcal{B}$ such that for any measurable selector v_2^* of (3.23) and any compact ball $\mathcal{B}_1\supset\mathcal{B}$ we have

$$V(x)\;=\;\mathbb{E}_x^{v_2^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\check\tau_1}[r(X_s,v_2^*(X_s))-\lambda_{\max}]\,\mathrm{d}s}V(X_{\check\tau_1})\right],\quad \text{for}\quad x\in\mathcal{B}_1^c, \tag{3.24}$$

where $\check\tau_1=\tau(\mathcal{B}_1^c)$. Moreover, for all $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\lambda_{\max}=\sup_{U^2\in\mathfrak{U}_2}\limsup_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\log\mathbb{E}_x\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^T r(X_s,U_s^2)\,\mathrm{d}s}\right],$$

and any measurable selector of (3.23) is an optimal stationary Markov control.

Proof. Select $(V,\lambda_{\max})$ as a sub-sequential limit of $(V_m,\lambda_{2,m})$. Then from the discussion preceding Lemma 3.5 we see that (3.23) and (3.24) hold. Also from the construction of r_m we have $r_m\ge r$ for all $(x,\tilde u_2)\in\mathbb{R}^d\times\tilde{\mathbb{U}}$. Therefore by (3.21) we have

$$\sup_{U^2\in\mathfrak{U}_2}\mathcal{E}_x(r,U^2)\;\le\;\lambda_{\max},\quad \text{for all } x\in\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{3.25}$$

Let v_2^* be a measurable selector of (3.23) i.e.,

$$\Big(\tfrac12\, a^{ij}(x)\,\partial_{ij}V(x)+b^i(x,v_2^*)\,\partial_i V(x)\,+r(x,v_2^*)V\Big)=\lambda_{\max}\,V(x). \tag{3.26}$$

By [4, Corollary 2.3] only principal eigenvalue of the elliptic operator in (3.26) can have such stochastic representation (3.24). Combining this with Lemma 2.1 we note that $\lambda_{\max}=\mathcal{E}_x(r,v_2^*)$ for all x. Thus by (3.25),

$$\sup_{U^2\in\mathfrak{U}_2}\mathcal{E}_x(r,U^2)\;=\;\lambda_{\max},\quad \text{for all } x\in\mathbb{R}^d,$$

and v_2^* is an optimal stationary Markov control. □

Let us now prove Theorem 3.1

Proof of Theorem 3.1. (i) and (ii) follows from Lemma 3.5. So we need to prove (iii) and (iv). To prove (iii) we assume that there exists positive $\widehat V\in\mathcal{W}^{2,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $p\in(1,\infty)$, that satisfies

$$\max_{\tilde u_2\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2}\Big(\tfrac12\, a^{ij}(x)\,\partial_{ij}\widehat V(x)+b^i(x,\tilde u_2)\,\partial_i \widehat V(x)\,+r(x,\tilde u_2)\widehat V\Big)\;=\;\lambda_{\max}\,\widehat V(x)\quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{3.27}$$

Let v_2^* be a measurable selector of (3.23). Using (3.27)

$$\tfrac12\, a^{ij}(x)\,\partial_{ij}\widehat V(x)+b^i(x,v_2^*)\,\partial_i \widehat V(x)\,+r(x,v_2^*)\widehat V\;\le\;\lambda_{\max}\,\widehat V(x)\quad \text{a.e. in } \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{3.28}$$

Applying Itô-Krylov formula to (3.28), with the same compact ball $\mathcal{B}_1$ as in (3.24), we obtain, for $x \in \mathcal{B}_1^c$,

$$\widehat{V}(x) \;\geq\; \mathbb{E}_x^{v_2^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\check{\tau}_1}[r(X_s,v_2^*(X_s))-\lambda_{\max}]\,\mathrm{d}s}\widehat{V}(X_{\check{\tau}_1})\right]. \tag{3.29}$$

Using (3.24) and (3.29) one has

$$\widehat{V}(x)-V(x)\geq\; \mathbb{E}_x^{v_2^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\check{\tau}_1}[r(X_s,v_2^*(X_s))-\lambda_{\max}]\,\mathrm{d}s}\big(\widehat{V}(X_{\check{\tau}_1})-V(X_{\check{\tau}_1})\big)\right].$$

Therefore if we multiply V by a suitable positive constant so that $\widehat{V}-V$ is non-negative in $\mathcal{B}_1$ and has its minimum 0 in $\mathcal{B}_1$, the above display indicates that $\widehat{V}-V\geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with its minimum in $\mathcal{B}_1$. On the other hand by (3.26) and (3.28) one has

$$\begin{aligned}&\tfrac{1}{2}\,a^{ij}(x)\,\partial_{ij}(\widehat{V}-V)+b^i(x,v_2^*)\,\partial_i(\widehat{V}-V)\;-(r(x,v_2^*)-\lambda_{\max})^-(\widehat{V}-V)\\&\quad\leq\;-(r(x,v_2^*)-\lambda_{\max})^+\,(\widehat{V}-V)\\&\quad\leq\;0.\end{aligned}$$

Hence applying strong maximum principle [20, Theorem 9.6] one has $V=\widehat{V}$. This proves uniqueness.

Let us now prove (iv). Suppose $\tilde{v}$ is an optimal stationary Markov control, i.e., $\mathcal{E}_x(r,\tilde{v})=\lambda_{\max}$. By [4, Theorem 3.2 and 3.3] there exists positive $\tilde{V}\in\mathcal{W}^{2,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $p>1$, such that

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\,a^{ij}(x)\,\partial_{ij}\tilde{V}(x)+b^i(x,\tilde{v})\,\partial_i\tilde{V}(x)\;+r(x,\tilde{v})\tilde{V}\;=\;\lambda_{\max}\tilde{V}, \tag{3.30}$$

and $\lambda_{\max}=\mathcal{E}_x(r,\tilde{v})$ for all $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$. Moreover $\tilde{V}$ will have stochastic representation with respect to some compact ball $\mathcal{B}$. Now (3.23) gives

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\,a^{ij}(x)\,\partial_{ij}V(x)+b^i(x,\tilde{v})\,\partial_iV(x)\;+r(x,\tilde{v})V\;\leq\;\lambda_{\max}V. \tag{3.31}$$

Applying Itô-Krylov formula we also have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{V}(x)=&\;\mathbb{E}_x^{\tilde{v}}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\check{\tau}}[r(X_s,\tilde{v}(X_s))-\lambda_{\max}]\,\mathrm{d}s}\tilde{V}(X_{\check{\tau}})\right],\\V(x)\geq&\;\mathbb{E}_x^{\tilde{v}}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\check{\tau}}[r(X_s,\tilde{v}(X_s))-\lambda_{\max}]\,\mathrm{d}s}V(X_{\check{\tau}})\right].\end{aligned}$$

Therefore with the help of these stochastic representations and (3.30)-(3.31) we can follow the same argument as above (for uniqueness) to conclude that $V=\tilde{V}$. Thus the inequality in (3.31) is in fact an equality and $\tilde{v}$ is a measurable selector of (3.23). Hence the proof. □

4. **Proof of the Theorem 2.1**

In this section we prove Theorem 2.1. The proof is devided in several lemmas. All the results in this section are valid under any one of the Conditions 2.1 and 2.2. Recall that B_n denotes the open ball of radius n around 0. By $\mathbb{S}$ we denote the set of all real symmetric matrices. Let $F:\mathbb{S}\times\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}$ be defined as follows

$$F(M,p,v,x)=\max_{\tilde{u}_2\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2}\min_{\tilde{u}_1\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_1}\Big(\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}(x)M^{ij}+b(x,\tilde{u}_1,\tilde{u}_2)\cdot p+c(x,\tilde{u}_1,\tilde{u}_2)v\Big).$$

Note that F is linear in M when other variables are kept fixed. Then by [5, Theorem 2.2], [22] there exists an (unique) eigenpair $(\psi_n, \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}_{\mathrm{loc}}(B_n) \cap \mathcal{C}(\bar{B}_n) \times \mathbb{R}$ with $\psi_n > 0$, such that

$$F(D^2\psi_n, D\psi_n, \psi_n, x) = \lambda_n \psi_n, \quad \text{in } B_n, \quad \text{and } \psi_n = 0 \text{ on } \partial B_n. \tag{4.1}$$

The above should be understood in the sense of viscosity solution. From the structure of F it easy to see that ψ_n is a viscosity solution of

$$\frac{1}{2} a^{ij}(x) \partial_{ij} \Psi = f(x),$$

where

$$f(x) \;:=\; - \max_{\tilde{u}_2 \in \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2} \min_{\tilde{u}_1 \in \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_1} \Big(b(x, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) \cdot \nabla \psi_n(x) + c(x, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) \psi_n(x) \Big) + \lambda_n \psi_n(x),$$

is locally Hölder continuous in B_n. Therefore using (A1), (A3) and [15, Theorem 3] we get $\psi_n \in \mathcal{C}^{2,\alpha}_{\mathrm{loc}}(B_n)$ for some $\alpha > 0$. We start with the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that either Condition 2.1 or Condition 2.2 holds. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an eigenpair $(\psi_n, \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{C}^2(B_n) \cap \mathcal{C}(\bar{B}_n) \times \mathbb{R}$ with $\psi_n > 0$ satisfying (4.1). Moreover, the set $\{\lambda_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded.*

Proof. In view of the discussion above we only need to show that $\{\lambda_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a bounded set. Note that by [17, Theorem 3]

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{\tilde{u}_2 \in \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2} \min_{\tilde{u}_1 \in \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_1} \Big(\frac{1}{2} a^{ij}(x) \partial_{ij} \psi_n(x) + b(x, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) \cdot \nabla \psi_n(x) + c(x, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) \psi_n(x) \Big) \\
&\quad = \min_{\tilde{u}_1 \in \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_1} \max_{\tilde{u}_2 \in \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2} \Big(\frac{1}{2} a^{ij}(x) \partial_{ij} \psi_n(x) + b(x, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) \cdot \nabla \psi_n(x) + c(x, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2) \psi_n(x) \Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Let v_2^n be a outer maximizing selector of the LHS above and v_1^n be a outer minimizing selector of RHS above. It is easy to check that

$$\frac{1}{2} a^{ij}(x) \partial_{ij} \psi_n(x) + b(x, v_1^n, v_2^n) \cdot \nabla \psi_n(x) + c(x, v_1^n, v_2^n) \psi_n(x) = \lambda_n \psi_n(x). \tag{4.2}$$

Extend the Markov controls in $\mathbb{R}^d$ by setting $v_1^n(x) = u_1$ and $v_2^n(x) = u_2$ for all $x \in B_n^c$ where $(u_1, u_2) \in \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_1 \times \tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2$ is fixed. Let $\tau_n = \tau(B_n)$. Then appying Itô's formula to (4.2) we have, for $x \in B_n$ and $v^n = (v_1^n, v_2^n)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_n(x) &= \mathbb{E}_x^v \left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^T [c(X_s, v_1^n(X_s), v_2^n(X_s)) - \lambda_n] \, \mathrm{d}s} \psi_n(X_T) \mathbb{1}_{\{T < \tau_n\}} \right] \\
&\le \; \|\psi_n\|_\infty \, \mathbb{E}_x^v \left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^T [c(X_s, v_1^n(X_s), v_2^n(X_s)) - \lambda_n] \, \mathrm{d}s} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore taking logarithm on both sides, diving by T and letting $T \to \infty$, we get

$$\lambda_n \le \mathcal{E}_x(v_1^n, v_2^n). \tag{4.3}$$

Under Condition 2.1 we have c bounded and thus

$$\sup_{(U^1, U^2) \in \mathfrak{U}_1 \times \mathfrak{U}_2} \mathcal{E}_x(U^1, U^2) \le \|c\|_\infty < \infty.$$

Suppose Condition 2.2 holds. It is easy to see from (2.6) that

$$\sup_{(U^1,U^2)\in\mathfrak{U}_1\times\mathfrak{U}_2} \mathcal{E}_x(\ell,U^1,U^2) \le \tfrac{\beta}{\min_{\mathcal{K}}\mathcal{V}}.$$

Since $c\in\mathcal{C}_\ell$, $\max_{u\in\mathbb{U}_1\times\mathbb{U}_2} c(\cdot,u)\le\kappa+\ell(\cdot)$ for some positive κ. Hence

$$\sup_{(U^1,U^2)\in\mathfrak{U}_1\times\mathfrak{U}_2} \mathcal{E}_x(c,U^1,U^2) \le \kappa+\tfrac{\beta}{\min_{\mathcal{K}}\mathcal{V}}.$$

Combining these with (4.3) we have

$$\lambda_n\le\kappa_1,\quad \text{for all } n\ge 1, \text{ and for some constant } \kappa_1. \tag{4.4}$$

Thus it remains to show that the set $\{\lambda_n : n\in\mathbb{N}\}$ is also bounded from below. We define the elliptic operator L^n as

$$L^n\varphi=\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}(x)\partial_{ij}\varphi(x)+b(x,v_1^n,v_2^n)\cdot\nabla\varphi(x)+c(x,v_1^n,v_2^n)\varphi(x).$$

Then from (4.2) we see that (ψ_n,λ_n) is the principal eigenpair of L^n for the Dirichlet problem in B_n. If $\hat\lambda^n$ denote the principal eigenvalue of L^n in B_1 then by monotonicity property of principal eigenvalues (with respect to domains ordered with respect to set inclusion) we know that $\lambda_n\ge\hat\lambda^n$. On the other hand by [26, Proposition 4.1] there exists a constant κ_0, independent of n, such that $\hat\lambda^n\ge\kappa_0$. Thus $\lambda_n\ge\kappa_0$ for all n. This completes the proof combining with (4.4). □

Set $\psi_n(0)=1$. Then by Harnack's inequality [20, Corollary 9.25] and (4.2) we have for any compact set $K\subset B_n$, $\{\psi_n : n\ge1\}$ uniformly bounded in $\mathcal{W}^{2,p}(K), p>d$ (see (3.5)). By a standard diagonalization argument we can extract a subsequence of $\{\psi_n : n\ge1\}$ that converges to some $V\in\mathcal{W}^{2,p}_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $p>1$, strongly in $\mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\alpha\in(0,1)$, and weakly in $\mathcal{W}^{2,p}_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $p>1$.

Lemma 4.2. *If (V,Λ) is any sub-sequential limit of (ψ_n,λ_n), as obtained above, then we have $V\in\mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and*

$$\max_{\tilde u_2\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2}\min_{\tilde u_1\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_1}\Big(\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}(x)\partial_{ij}V(x)+b(x,\tilde u_1,\tilde u_2)\cdot\nabla V(x)+c(x,\tilde u_1,\tilde u_2)V(x)\Big)=\Lambda\,V(x),\quad V>0. \tag{4.5}$$

Moreover,

$$\Lambda\ \le\ \underline{\Lambda}=\sup_{U^2\in\mathfrak{U}_2}\mathcal{J}_{\rm inf}(x,U^2)=\sup_{U^2\in\mathfrak{U}_2}\inf_{U^1\in\mathfrak{U}_1}\mathcal{E}_x(U^1,U^2). \tag{4.6}$$

Proof. Since ψ_n converges to V along some subsequence, strongly in $\mathcal{C}^{1,\alpha}_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\alpha\in(0,1)$, and weakly in $\mathcal{W}^{2,p}_{\rm loc}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $p>1$, we can pass limit in (4.1) to obtain (4.5). Regularity of V can be improved to $\mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ using ellipticity of a, (A1) and standard elliptic regularity estimates. Now fix $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$ and choose n large enough so that $x\in B_n$. Recall the outer maximizing selector v_2^n from Lemma 4.1. Then for any $U^1\in\mathfrak{U}_1$ we have

$$\Big(\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}(X_s)\partial_{ij}\psi_n(X_s)+b(X_s,U^1_s,v_2^n(X_s))\cdot\nabla\psi_n(X_s)+c(X_s,U^1_s,v_2^n(X_s))\psi_n(X_s)\Big)\ \ge\ \lambda_n\,\psi_n(X_s),$$

almost surely for $s < \tau_n$. Thus following a similar calculation as in Lemma 4.1 (see (4.3)) we obtain

$$\lambda_n \le \mathcal{E}_x(v_2^n, U^1).$$

Since U^1 has been chosen arbitrarily we get $\lambda_n \le \inf_{U^1\in\mathfrak{U}_1} \mathcal{E}_x(v_2^n, U^1) = \mathcal{J}_{\inf}(x, v_2^n) \le \underline{\Lambda}$. Now let $n \to \infty$ to obtain (4.6). □

Following result shows that Λ, obtained in Lemma 4.2, is actually value of the game.

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose that either Condition 2.1 or Condition 2.2 holds. Let $(V, \Lambda) \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \times \mathbb{R}$ be the eigenpair obtained in Lemma 4.2. Then we have*

$$\bar{\Lambda} = \inf_{U^1\in\mathfrak{U}_1} \mathcal{J}_{\sup}(x, U^1) = \inf_{U^1\in\mathfrak{U}_1} \sup_{U^2\in\mathfrak{U}_2} \mathcal{E}_x(U^1, U^2) \;\le\; \Lambda. \tag{4.7}$$

Thus we have $\bar{\Lambda} = \Lambda = \underline{\Lambda}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof. Fix an outer minimizer v_1^* of (4.5) and consider the maximization problem with $r(x, \tilde{u}_2) = c(x, v_1^*(x), \tilde{u}_2)$

$$\text{maximize } \mathcal{E}_x(r, U^2), \quad \text{over } \mathfrak{U}_2.$$

From Theroem 3.1 we know that there exists a stationary Markov control w_2^* which is optimal for the above maximization problem. Moreover, if $\lambda_{\max}$ is the maximum value we have $\lambda_{\max} = \mathcal{E}_x(c, v_1^*, w_2^*)$ for all x. On the other hand from (4.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}(x)\partial_{ij}V(x) + b(x, v_1^*, w_2^*)\cdot\nabla V(x) + c(x, v_1^*, w_2^*)V(x)\\
&\quad\le\; \max_{\tilde{u}_2\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}}\Big(\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}(x)\partial_{ij}V(x) + b(x, v_1^*, \tilde{u}_2)\cdot\nabla V(x) + c(x, v_1^*, \tilde{u}_2)V(x)\Big)\\
&\quad=\; \min_{\tilde{u}_1\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}}\max_{\tilde{u}_2\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}}\Big(\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}(x)\partial_{ij}V(x) + b(x, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2)\cdot\nabla V(x) + c(x, \tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2)V(x)\Big)\\
&\quad=\; \Lambda\, V(x)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore by the definition of principal eigenvalue (2.10) we see that Λ is bigger than the principal eigenvalue of $\mathcal{L}_{(v_1^*, w_2^*)} + c(x, v_1^*, w_2^*)$. Combining with Lemma 2.1 we have $\mathcal{E}_x(c, v_1^*, w_2^*) \le \Lambda$. Thus

$$\Lambda \ge \sup_{U^2\in\mathfrak{U}_2} \mathcal{E}_x(v_1^*, U^2) \;\ge\; \inf_{U^1\in\mathfrak{U}_1} \mathcal{J}_{\sup}(x, U^1) = \bar{\Lambda}. \tag{4.8}$$

This proves (4.7). Since $\underline{\Lambda} \le \bar{\Lambda}$ in general, it follows from Lemma 4.2 that $\bar{\Lambda} = \Lambda = \underline{\Lambda}$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. □

Now onwards we fix an outer maximizing strategy v_2^* and outer minimizing strategy v_1^* of (4.5). Let us now show that the value Λ is achieved by applying the strategy $v^* = (v_1^*, v_2^*)$.

Lemma 4.4. *Suppose that either Condition 2.1 or Condition 2.2 holds. Let (V, Λ) be an eigenpair obtained in Lemma 4.2. Then we have a compact ball $\mathcal{B}$ such that for any compact ball $\mathcal{B}_1 \supset \mathcal{B}$ we have*

$$V(x) \;=\; \mathbb{E}_x^{v^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\breve{\tau}_1}[c(X_s, v_1^*(X_s), v_2^*(X_s)) - \Lambda]\,\mathrm{d}s} V(X_{\breve{\tau}_1})\right], \quad \textit{for} \quad x \in \mathcal{B}_1^c,$$

where $\breve{\tau}_1 = \tau(\mathcal{B}_1^c)$. Moreover, $\Lambda = \mathcal{E}_x(v_1^*, v_2^*)$.

Proof. From (4.5) we have

$$\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}(x)\partial_{ij}V + b(x, v_1^*, v_2^*)\cdot\nabla V + c(x, v_1^*, v_2^*)V = \Lambda\, V. \tag{4.9}$$

Then following the calculations of Lemma 3.3, we can find a compact set $\mathcal{B}$ such that for any compact ball $\mathcal{B}_1 \supset \mathcal{B}$ we have

$$V(x) \;=\; \mathbb{E}_x^{v^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\breve{\tau}_1}[c(X_s, v_1^*(X_s), v_2^*(X_s))-\Lambda]\,\mathrm{d}s} V(X_{\breve{\tau}_1})\right], \quad \text{for} \quad x\in\mathcal{B}_1^c, \tag{4.10}$$

where $\breve{\tau}_1 = \tau(\mathcal{B}_1^c)$. But (4.10) is known as the stochastic representation of V, and therefore by [4, Corollary 2.3] Λ is the principal eigenvalue of the elliptic operator (4.9) in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Hence, by Lemma 2.1, $\Lambda = \mathcal{E}_x(v_1^*, v_2^*)$ for all $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$. □

Thus so far we have shown that the game has a value Λ, and the value is attained by the strategy (v_1^*, v_2^*). Let us now show that (v_1^*, v_2^*) is in fact a saddle point strategy.

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose that either Condition 2.1 or Condition 2.2 holds. Let (v_1^*, v_2^*) be same as we have chosen in Lemma 4.4. Then we have for all $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\mathcal{E}_x(v_1^*, U^2) \;\le\; \mathcal{E}(v_1^*, v_2^*) \;\le\; \mathcal{E}_x(U^1, v_2^*), \quad \forall\, U^1\in\mathfrak{U}_1, \text{ and } U^2\in\mathfrak{U}_2. \tag{4.11}$$

In other words, (v_1^*, v_2^*) is a saddle point strategy.

Proof. The first inequality in (4.11) follows from (4.8). So we only prove the second inequality. Let us first show that for any stationary Markov control $v:\mathbb{R}^d\to\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_1$ we have

$$\mathcal{E}(v_1^*, v_2^*) \;\le\; \mathcal{E}(v, v_2^*). \tag{4.12}$$

The proof of (4.12) is based on the method of contradiction. Suppose that $\Lambda = \mathcal{E}(v_1^*, v_2^*) > \mathcal{E}(v, v_2^*) = \lambda_v$. Then following the same argument as in [4, Theorem 4.1 and 4.2] (see also Section 3) we can find a positive eigenfunction $\widehat{V}\in\mathcal{W}^{2,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $p>1$, such that

$$\Big(\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}\partial_{ij}\widehat{V} + b(x, v, v_2^*)\cdot\nabla\widehat{V} + c(x, v, v_2^*)\widehat{V}\Big) = \lambda_v\widehat{V}, \tag{4.13}$$

and for a suitable compact set $\mathcal{B}$ we have for $\mathcal{B}_1\supset\mathcal{B}$ hitting time $\breve{\tau}_1$

$$\widehat{V}(x) = \mathbb{E}_x^{\hat{v}}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\breve{\tau}_1}[c(X_s,\hat{v}(X_s))-\lambda_v]\,\mathrm{d}s}\widehat{V}(X_{\breve{\tau}_1})\right], \quad \text{for} \quad x\in\mathcal{B}_1^c,\ \hat{v}=(v, v_2^*). \tag{4.14}$$

This can be obtained by a similar argument as in Lemma 3.3. On the other hand we have from (4.5) that

$$\Big(\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}\partial_{ij}V + b(x, v, v_2^*)\cdot\nabla V + c(x, v, v_2^*)V\Big) \ge \Lambda V. \tag{4.15}$$

Using the stochastic representation in Lemma 4.4 we find that for some constants $\kappa_2, \hat{\theta}\in(0,1)$, $V(x)\le\kappa\,(\mathcal{V}(x))^{\hat{\theta}}$. Therefore following a similar calculation as in Lemma 3.3 and using (4.15) we obtain

$$V(x) \;\le\; \mathbb{E}_x\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\breve{\tau}_1}[c(X_s, v, v_2^*)-\Lambda]\,\mathrm{d}s} V(X_{\breve{\tau}_1})\right], \quad \text{for} \quad x\in\mathcal{B}_1^c, \tag{4.16}$$

for some large compact ball $\mathcal{B}_1$. Since $\Lambda > \lambda_v$ we have from (4.14) and (4.16) that for $x \in \mathcal{B}_1^c$,

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{V}(x) - V(x) \geq\ & \mathbb{E}_x\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\check{\tau}_1}[c(X_s,v,v_2^*)-\lambda_v]\,\mathrm{d}s}\widehat{V}(X_{\check{\tau}_1})\right] - \mathbb{E}_x\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\check{\tau}_1}[c(X_s,v,v_2^*)-\Lambda]\,\mathrm{d}s}V(X_{\check{\tau}_1})\right]\\ \geq\ & \mathbb{E}_x\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\check{\tau}_1}[c(X_s,v,v_2^*)-\Lambda]\,\mathrm{d}s}\big(\widehat{V}(X_{\check{\tau}_1}) - V(X_{\check{\tau}_1})\big)\right].\end{aligned}$$

Hence we can multiply V by a suitable positive constant so that $\widehat{V} - V \geq 0$ and attends its minimum 0 in $\mathcal{B}_1$. Moreover, from (4.13) and (4.15) we also have

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big(\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}\partial_{ij}(\widehat{V}-V) + b(x,v,v_2^*)\cdot\nabla(\widehat{V}-V) - (c(x,v,v_2^*)-\lambda_v)^-(\widehat{V}-V)\Big)\\ &\leq\ -(c(x,v,v_2^*)-\lambda_v)^+(\widehat{V}-V) - (\Lambda-\lambda_v)V\\ &\leq\ 0.\end{aligned}$$

Thus by strong maximum principle [20, Theorem 9.6] we should have $V = \widehat{V}$ which would lead to $\lambda_v \geq \Lambda$ from (4.13) and (4.15). This is a contradiction. Hence we have (4.12).

Now to compete the proof of (4.11) we consider the following minimization problem

$$\inf_{U^1\in\mathfrak{U}_1} \mathcal{E}(U^1, v_2^*).$$

But this problem has a minimizer in the class of stationary Markov controls. This can be seen mimicking the arguments of [4, Theorem 4.1 and 4.2] for measurable cost functions (see also Section 3 for a similar argument). Then the second inequality in (4.11) follows from (4.12). □

Now we are ready to prove the uniqueness of the value function.

Lemma 4.6. *Let Λ be the value of the game, as obtained above. Then there exists a unique $V \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ that satisfies (4.5) with $V(0) = 1$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\tilde{V} \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is another solution to

$$\begin{aligned}&\min_{\tilde{u}_1\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_1}\max_{\tilde{u}_2\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2}\Big(\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}\partial_{ij}\tilde{V} + b(x,\tilde{u}_1,\tilde{u}_2)\cdot\nabla\tilde{V} + c(x,v_1,v_2)\tilde{V}\Big)\\ &\quad= \max_{\tilde{u}_2\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2}\min_{\tilde{u}_1\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_1}\Big(\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}\partial_{ij}\tilde{V} + b(x,\tilde{u}_1,\tilde{u}_2)\cdot\nabla\tilde{V} + c(x,\tilde{u}_1,\tilde{u}_2)\tilde{V}\Big) = \Lambda\tilde{V}. \qquad (4.17)\end{aligned}$$

Let $\tilde{v}_1^*$ be an outer minimizing selector of (4.17). Recall v_2^* from Lemma 4.4. Then we have from (4.17) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big(\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}\partial_{ij}\tilde{V} + b(x,\tilde{v}_1^*,v_2^*)\cdot\nabla\tilde{V} + c(x,\tilde{v}_1^*,v_2^*)\tilde{V}\Big)\\ &\quad\leq \max_{\tilde{u}_2\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2}\Big(\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}\partial_{ij}\tilde{V} + b(x,\tilde{v}_1^*,\tilde{u}_2)\cdot\nabla\tilde{V} + c(x,\tilde{v}_1^*,\tilde{u}_2)\tilde{V}\Big) = \Lambda\tilde{V} \qquad (4.18)\end{aligned}$$

Let $\tilde{v}^* = (\tilde{v}_1^*, v_2^*)$ and $c_{\tilde{v}^*} = c(x,\tilde{v}_1^*(x), v_2^*(x))$. Applying Itô's formula to (4.18) and then Fatou's lemma we have for any closed ball $\mathcal{B}$

$$\tilde{V}(x) \ \geq\ \mathbb{E}_x^{\tilde{v}^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\check{\tau}}[c_{\tilde{v}^*}(X_s)-\Lambda]\,\mathrm{d}s}\tilde{V}(X_{\check{\tau}})\right], \quad \text{for} \quad x \in \mathcal{B}^c. \qquad (4.19)$$

On the other hand from (4.5) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big(\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}\partial_{ij}V + b(x,\tilde{v}_1^*,v_2^*)\cdot\nabla V + c(x,\tilde{v}_1^*,v_2^*)V\Big)\\
&\quad\geq \min_{\tilde{u}_1\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_1}\Big(\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}\partial_{ij}V + b(x,\tilde{u}_1,v_2^*)\cdot\nabla V + c(x,\tilde{u}_1,v_2^*)V\Big)\\
&\quad= \max_{\tilde{u}_2\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_2}\min_{\tilde{u}_1\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_1}\Big(\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}\partial_{ij}V + b(x,\tilde{u}_1,\tilde{u}_2)\cdot\nabla V + c(x,\tilde{u}_1,\tilde{u}_2)V\Big)\\
&\quad= \Lambda V
\end{aligned}\tag{4.20}$$

Since $V\leq\kappa_2(\mathcal{V})^{\hat{\theta}}$ by Lemma 4.4, applying Itô's formula as before (see Lemma 3.3) to (4.20) we obtain, for a suitable closed ball $\mathcal{B}$,

$$V(x)\;\leq\;\mathbb{E}_x^{\tilde{v}^*}\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\check{\tau}}[c_{\tilde{v}^*}(X_s)-\Lambda]\,\mathrm{d}s}V(X_{\check{\tau}})\right],\quad\text{for}\quad x\in\mathcal{B}^c.\tag{4.21}$$

Now use (4.19) and (4.21), scale V by multiplying a suitable positive constant, so that $\tilde{V}-V\geq 0$ and it attains its minimum 0 in $\mathcal{B}$. Again from (4.18) and (4.20) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big(\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}\partial_{ij}(\tilde{V}-V) + b(x,\tilde{v}_1^*,v_2^*)\cdot\nabla(\tilde{V}-V) - (c_{\tilde{v}^*}(x)-\Lambda)^-(\tilde{V}-V)\Big)\\
&\leq -(c_{\tilde{v}^*}(x)-\Lambda)^+(\tilde{V}-V)\\
&\leq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying strong maximum principle [20, Theorem 9.6] we have $V=\tilde{V}$. Hence the proof. □

Finally we are left with proving the verification result for saddle point strategy.

Lemma 4.7. *Suppose that either Condition 2.1 or Condition 2.2 holds. Consider a stationary Markov control pair $(\hat{v}_1,\hat{v}_2)\in\mathfrak{U}_1^{\mathrm{SM}}\times\mathfrak{U}_2^{\mathrm{SM}}$ which is a saddle point strategy i.e.,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}(\hat{v}_1,\hat{v}_2)\;&\leq\;\mathcal{E}(U^1,\hat{v}_2),\quad\textit{for all } U^1\in\mathfrak{U}_1,\\
\mathcal{E}(\hat{v}_1,\hat{v}_2)\;&\geq\;\mathcal{E}(\hat{v}_1,U^2),\quad\textit{for all } U^2\in\mathfrak{U}_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Then $\hat{v}_1$ is an outer minimizing selector of (2.9)*, and $\hat{v}_2$ is an outer maximizing selector of* (2.8)*.*

Proof. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda=\inf_{U^1\in\mathfrak{U}_1}\mathcal{J}_{\sup}(x,U^1)&\leq\sup_{U^2\in\mathfrak{U}_2}\mathcal{E}_x(\hat{v}_1,U^2)\\
&\leq\;\mathcal{E}_x(\hat{v}_1,\hat{v}_2)\leq\inf_{U^1\in\mathfrak{U}_1}\mathcal{E}_x(U^1,\hat{v}_2)\leq\sup_{U^2\in\mathfrak{U}_2}\mathcal{J}_{\inf}(x,U^2)=\Lambda,
\end{aligned}$$

we have $\mathcal{E}(\hat{v}_1,\hat{v}_2)=\Lambda$. We give the proof under Condition 2.1 and proof with the other condition is analogous. So we assume that Condition 2.1 holds. We give the proof for the first situation and proof for the other situation would be analogous. Therefore we show that $\hat{v}_2$ is an outer maximizing selector of (2.8). Fix $\hat{v}_2$ and consider the cost function $\hat{c}(x,u_1)=c(x,u_1,\hat{v}_2(x))$. Then from [4, Theorem 4.2] we can find $\widehat{V}\in\mathcal{W}^{2,p}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ that satisfies

$$\min_{\tilde{u}_1\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}_1}\Big(\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}\partial_{ij}\widehat{V} + b(x,\tilde{u}_1,\hat{v}_2)\cdot\nabla\widehat{V} + \hat{c}(x,\tilde{u}_1)\widehat{V}\Big)=\Lambda\widehat{V},\tag{4.22}$$

and for some positive constant $\kappa_2, \hat{\theta} \in (0,1)$, $\widehat{V} \le \kappa_2 (\mathcal{V})^{\hat{\theta}}$. Now choosing the control to v_1^* (which is same as in Lemma 4.4) we have from (4.22)

$$\Big(\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}\partial_{ij}\widehat{V} + b(x, v_1^*, \hat{v}_2)\cdot\nabla\widehat{V} + c(x, v_1^*, \hat{v}_2)\widehat{V}\Big) \ge \Lambda\widehat{V}. \tag{4.23}$$

Applying Itô's formula to (4.23) and following an argument similar to Lemma 3.3 we have

$$\widehat{V}(x) \le \mathbb{E}_x\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\breve{\tau}}[c(X_s, v_1^*, u_2^*)-\Lambda]\,\mathrm{d}s}\widehat{V}(X_{\breve{\tau}})\right], \quad \text{for} \quad x \in \mathcal{B}^c, \tag{4.24}$$

for some closed ball $\mathcal{B}$ and $\breve{\tau} = \tau(\mathcal{B}^c)$. On the other hand from (4.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda V &= \max_{v_2\in\tilde{\mathbb{U}}}\Big(\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}\partial_{ij}V + b(x, v_1^*, v_2)\cdot\nabla V + c(x, v_1^*, v_2)V\Big)\\ &\ge \Big(\frac{1}{2}a^{ij}\partial_{ij}V + b(x, v_1^*, \hat{v}_2)\cdot\nabla V + c(x, v_1^*, \hat{v}_2)V\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

and for the same closed ball $\mathcal{B}$

$$V(x) \ge \mathbb{E}_x\left[\mathrm{e}^{\int_0^{\breve{\tau}}[c(X_s, v_1^*, u_2^*)-\Lambda]\,\mathrm{d}s}V(X_{\breve{\tau}})\right], \quad \text{for} \quad x \in \mathcal{B}^c. \tag{4.26}$$

Now following the proof of Lemma 4.6 and using (4.23)-(4.26) we get $V = \widehat{V}$. Therefore from (4.22) and (2.8) we see that $\hat{v}_2$ is an outer maximizing selector. Hence the proof. □

Finally we are ready to prove Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Existence of $(V, \Lambda) \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)\times\mathbb{R}$ which satisfies (2.7) follows from Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.4. Lemma 4.3 implies (i). (ii) follows from Lemma 4.5 and (iii) follows from Lemma 4.6. Verification part (iv) follows from Lemma 4.7. □

Acknowledgements. This research of Anup Biswas was partly supported by an INSPIRE faculty fellowship. Subhamay Saha acknowledges the hospitality of the Department of Mathematics in IISER-Pune while he was visiting at the early stages of this work.

References

[1] Charalambos D. Aliprantis, Kim C. Border . Infinite dimensional analysis. A hitchhiker's guide. Third edition. Springer, Berlin, 2006. xxii+703 pp.
[2] Ari Arapostathis, Vivek S. Borkar, M. K. Ghosh. Ergodic control of diffusion processes, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 143. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2011)
[3] Ari Arapostathis, Anup Biswas. Infinite horizon risk-sensitive control of diffusions without any blanket stability assumptions. ArXiv e-prints 1601.00258 (2016).
[4] Ari Arapostathis, Anup Biswas, Subhamay Saha. Strict monotonicity of principal eigenvalues of elliptic operators in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and risk-sensitive control. preprint.
[5] Scott Armstrong. Principal eigenvalues and an anti-maximum principle for homogeneous fully nonlinear elliptic equations, J. Differential Equations 246 , no. 7, 2958–2987 (2009)
[6] T. Basar, Nash equilibria of risk-sensitive nonlinear stochastic differential games, J. Optim. Theory Appl., 100, 479–498 (1999)
[7] A. Basu, M. K. Ghosh. Zero-sum risk-sensitive stochastic differential games. Math. Oper. Res. 37(3), 437–449 (2012). DOI 10.1287/moor.1120.0542.
[8] H. Berestycki, L. Rossi. Generalizations and properties of the principal eigenvalue of elliptic operators in unbounded domains. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 68(6), 1014–1065 (2015)
[9] Anup Biswas. An eigenvalue approach to the risk sensitive control problem in near monotone case. Systems Control Lett. 60(3), 181–184 (2011)

[10] Anup Biswas. Risk sensitive control of diffusions with small running cost. Appl. Math. Optim.64(1),1–12(2011)
[11] Anup Biswas, Vivek S. Borkar, K. Suresh Kumar. Risk-sensitive control with near monotone cost. Appl. Math. Optim. 62(2), 145–163 (2010) Errata corriege I, ibid, 62(2)(2010), pp. 165-167. Errata corriege II, ibid, 62(3)(2010), pp. 435-438.
[12] V. I. Bogachev, N. V. Krylov, and M. Rockner. On regularity of transition probabilities and invariant measures of singular diffusions under minimal conditions. Comm. Partial Differential Equations 26(11-12), 2037–2080 (2001)
[13] Vivek S. Borkar. A topology for Markov controls. Appl. Math. Optim. 20 , no. 1, 55–62 (1989)
[14] V.S. Borkar, M. K. Ghosh. Stochastic differential games: occupation measure based approach. J. Optim. Theory Appl. 73, no. 2, 359–385 (1992).
[15] L.A. Caffarelli, Interior a priori estimates for solutions of fully nonlinear equations, Ann. of Math. (2) 130 (1) 189–213 (1989)
[16] N. El-Karoui, S. Hamadene. BSDE and risk-sensitive control, zero-sum and nonzero-sum game problems of stochastic functional differential equations. Stochastic Proc. Appl. 107(1):145–169 (2003)
[17] K. Fan, Fixed-point and minimax theorems in locally convex topological linear spaces. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sc., 38, pp. 121-126 (1952)
[18] W. H. Fleming, W. M. McEneaney. Risk-sensitive control on an infinite time horizon. SIAM J. Control Optim. 33(6), 1881–1915 (1995)
[19] M. K. Ghosh, K. Suresh Kumar, C. Pal. Nonzero-sum risk-sensitive stochastic differential games. arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.01142 (2016)
[20] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger. Elliptic partial differential equations of second order, volume 224 of Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1983.
[21] I. Gyöngy and N. Krylov. Existence of strong solutions for Itô's stochastic equations via approximations. Probab. Theory Related Fields, 105(2):143–158, (1996)
[22] H. Ishii, Y. Yoshimura. Demi-eigenvalues for uniformly elliptic Isaacs operators, preprint.
[23] D.H. Jacobson. Optimal stochastic linear systems with exponential performance criteria and their relation to deterministic differential games, IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 124–131, (1973)
[24] N. V. Krylov. Controlled diffusion processes, volume 14 of Applications of Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1980.
[25] Paola, Mannucci. Nonzero-sum stochastic differential games with discontinuous feedback. SIAM J. Control Optim. 43 , no. 4, 1222–1233 (2004/05).
[26] A. Quaas, B. Sirakov. Principal eigenvalues and the Dirichlet problem for fully nonlinear elliptic operators. Adv. Math. 218(1), 105–135 (2008)
[27] H. Nagai. Bellman equations of risk-sensitive control. SIAM J. Control Optim. 34(1), 74–101(1996)
[28] P. Whittle, Risk-Sensitive Optimal Control, Wiley-Interscience Series in Systems and Optimization, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester, 1990.

Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, Dr. Homi Bhabha Road, Pune 411008, India.
E-mail address: anup@iiserpune.ac.in

Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Technology, Guwahati 781039, India.
E-mail address: saha.subhamay@iitg.ernet.in